

Serial No. 10/669,862
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14536US

REMARKS

Applicant has canceled claims 1-7, and amended claims 8 and 18. Thus, claims 8-19 remain pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Claim Objections:

The Examiner has objected to claim 18 due to an informality. Applicant has amended claim 18 to correct such informality as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 18.

Response To Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 8, 13, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Heron (USPN 6,343,251). The Examiner apparently reads Heron as disclosing Applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to clarify that turbine component tracking method recites that the marked turbine components are placed in a plurality of turbines. Heron merely discloses an individualized maintenance schedule for a turbine, and does not disclose or suggest marking turbine components or placing the marked turbine components in a plurality of turbines. See e.g. Applicant's Background section page 2 lines 20-22. As further explained in Applicant's Background section, if individualized turbine maintenance schedules are used, a problem arises if an individual turbine component is used on more than one turbine, and another problem arises if a component type is not identical with another similar component type, and yet another problem arises if some individual components are repaired or replaced while other individual component are not repaired or replaced within the turbine.

Dependent claims 13, 14 and 16-18 are also patentable based on their dependency from independent claim 8 as well as their own merit. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejection.

Serial No. 10/669,862**Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14536US****Response To Rejections Under Section 103:**

Claims 9-12, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious over Heron in view of Isobe (USPN 6,636,813).

For the reasons discussed in connection with the section 102 rejection, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the marked turbine components are placed in a plurality of turbines. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejection.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims and specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/7/06

By: *J.P. Musone*
John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830